

APPLICATION NO.

09/529,680

157

United States Patent and Trademark Office

FILING DATE

04/17/2000

01/18/2006

7590

PITTSBURGH, PA 15205

100 BAYER ROAD

BAYER MATERIAL SCIENCE LLC

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. D. Dox 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

PAPER NUMBER

	www.uspto.gov	
FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
GERHARD WOTTING	MO-5599/LEA3	1031
	EXAMINER	
	GROUP, KARL E	

ART UNIT

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Comment	09/529,680	WOTTING ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Karl E. Group	1755		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).				
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 D	ecember 2005			
·_ ·	action is non-final.			
) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters; prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1933 C.D. 14, 403 C.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	\$ †			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-18 and 24-28</u> is/are pending in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>14-18,24-28</u> is/are rejected.	•			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.				
D: 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •			
application from the International Bureau		•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)				
1)	4)			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		atent Application (PTO-152)		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:			

Application/Control Number: 09/529,680 Page 2

Art Unit: 1755

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 14-18,24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Oda et al (5,804,523), Tajima et al (5,885,916) and Hintermayer et al (5,998,319), each taken alone, for reasons of record.

Applicants' argument that the prior art references fail to teach a molar ratio of SiO2 to (SiO₂ + sintering aid) of .65 to .74 is not persuasive. It should be noted that when the ratio of the instant claims is converted to SiO₂ to (sintering aids other than SiO₂) the ratio is then 1.8 to 2.85. For example if the molar ratio of SiO2 to (SiO₂ + sintering aid) is .65 then the molar ratio of SiO2 to (sintering aid) is .65:.35 which is 1.8. Clearly the molar ratios taught by the prior art references fall within the ranges. Furthermore in view of the "comprising" (line 1) terminology the claim is considered to be open to more than one sintering aid. Note claims 16-18 refer to "sintering aids". As to the silicon oxynitride phase, the prior art references do not suggest the presence of this phase, therefor absent tangible evidence to the contrary, by way of a declaration the phase would not be expected to be present. Also applicants have not shown by way of tangible evi9denc that the prior art bodies do not posses the claimed properties.

It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA

Application/Control Number: 09/529,680 Page 3

Art Unit: 1755

1971). The examples of the instant specification do not have examples that are representative of the applied prior art.

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl E. Group whose telephone number is 571-272-1368. The examiner can normally be reached on M²F (6:30-4:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Keg 1-13-06 Karl E Group/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755